



THE CHLORINE INSTITUTE  
1300 Wilson Blvd., Suite 525, Arlington, VA 22209  
Tel 703-894-4140 Fax 703-894-4130  
www.chlorineinstitute.org

September 23, 2013

Surface Transportation Board  
ATTN: Docket No. EP 711  
395 E Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20423-0001

234856  
ENTERED  
Office of Proceedings  
September 23, 2013  
Part of Public  
Record

RE: EP 711 Revised Competitive Switching Rules Public Hearing – Notice to Participate

The Chlorine Institute, Inc. (CI) is a 195-member, not-for-profit trade association of chlor-alkali producers worldwide, as well as packagers, distributors, users, and suppliers. The Institute's mission is the promotion of safety and the protection of human health and the environment in the manufacture, distribution and use of chlorine, sodium hydroxide, potassium hydroxide and sodium hypochlorite, plus the distribution and use of hydrogen chloride. The Institute's North American Producer members account for more than 93 percent of the total chlorine production capacity of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.

This is a notice of intent to participate by The Chlorine Institute in the hearing announced by the Surface Transportation Board in a Federal Register Notice dated August 15, 2013 and scheduled for October 22, 2013. We request that Mr. Eddie Johnston, Dupont's Sustainability Manager and Chairman of The Chlorine Institute's Board Committee on Rail Issues, be granted 5 minutes to provide comments on behalf of the Institute on the subject.

Mr. Johnston's comments will cover CI's views on the impacts of revising the current competitive switching rules, as proposed by the National Industrial Transportation League's in their petition for rulemaking. Mr. Johnston will provide background regarding the chlorine industry's experience and issues with captive shipping locations. Mr. Johnston will also discuss the vital role that competition in the railroad industry has to enable the chlorine industry to help continue fueling the US economy and protecting public health and safety. Attached is a copy of CI's comments to the EP 711 docket, which are consistent with our expected public hearing testimony.

Your favorable action on this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robyn Kinsley  
Director, Transportation

**BEFORE THE  
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

---

**Ex Parte No. 711**

**PETITION FOR RULEMAKING TO ADOPT REVISED COMPETITIVE  
SWITCHING RULES**

---

**Comments of  
The Chlorine Institute, Inc.**

---

The Chlorine Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”) hereby submits these comments in response to the Board’s Notice of commencement of proceeding and request for comments on July 31, 2012 (the “July 31 Notice”). The Institute is pleased that the Board is open to considering rail dependent shipper proposals to help improve the state of rail competition, as evidenced in this Ex Parte 711 proceeding that was initiated to collect more information regarding the National Industrial Transportation League’s (the “NITL”) proposal related to competitive switching, as well as other proceedings including Ex Parte 705, Ex Parte 714 and Ex Parte 715. While it is encouraging to see that the Board is interested in creating a more competitive rail environment, the Institute is concerned about the non-integrated approach the Board is taking.

The Institute agrees with the intent behind the NITL’s proposal and that the rules currently applicable to reciprocal switching should be revised, but that action alone will not guarantee that all shippers across the board will have access to effective competition. As proposed, a Class I rail carrier would be required to enter into a competitive switching agreement if the criteria proposed in the NITL’s petition is met, or when certain

exceptions are made on a case-by-case basis, but it would not require or necessarily impel the carrier to provide a reasonable and competitive rate. The Institute does not fully share in the apparent belief that by requiring the railroads to enter into a switching agreement, which essentially still merely invites the major railroads to compete with one another, that they will actually depart from their current non-competitive conduct and begin to compete for market share based on reduced price and improved service.

In its July 31 Notice, the Board claims that:

*“This proposal has the potential to promote more rail-to-rail competition and reduce the agency’s role in regulating the reasonableness of transportation rates. It could permit the agency to rely on competitive market forces to discipline railroad pricing from origin to destination, and regulate only the access price for the first (or last) 30 miles.”*

It is troubling to think the Board feels it might be able to simply rely on presumed competitive market forces to discipline railroad pricing for general service rates and only regulate the access prices within the 30-mile interchange point radii, and with that, believes it would have a reduced role in regulating the reasonableness of rates. Potential revisions prompted by Ex Parte 711 will not be an end-all solution, and the Board cannot believe it might no longer need to address and regulate rate reasonableness. Although the number of rate disputes may reduce if revisions to the competitive switching rules take place, the potential for rate challenges will likely still remain and the Board’s role in regulating reasonableness in these challenges will continue to be a crucial factor to ensure fairness in the rail transportation market.

The Institute believes that a more holistic approach to rail competition issues is indicated both by the record in Ex Parte 705 and by the conduct of the major railroads over the past decade. The Institute suggests that the Board should examine the record in Ex Parte 711 in conjunction with the records in Ex Parte 705, Ex Parte 714 and Ex Parte 715 to determine what actions it might take to require the major railroads to effectively compete with one another rather than merely inviting them to compete. Such actions might involve reopening the three mega mergers of the 1990s to impose additional competitive conditions. The Institute stands ready to assist the Board in any such efforts.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robyn S. Kinsley  
Director, Transportation & Incident Analysis  
The Chlorine Institute  
1300 Wilson Blvd  
Suite 525  
Arlington, VA 22209  
Telephone: (703) 894-4123  
Email: [rkinsley@cl2.com](mailto:rkinsley@cl2.com)

March 1, 2013